

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 8, 2004. Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-21 and 24-39 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, 19, and 28 are in independent form. Claims 4, 5, 13, 14, 22, and 23 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and those claims will not be mentioned further. Claim 39 has been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 18, 19, 21, 28, 33, 34, 36 and 37 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-3, 7-12, 16-21 and 25-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,330,068 (Matsuyama), and Claims 6, 15, and 24 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Matsuyama* in view of U.S. Patent 6,351,317 (Sasaki et al.).

The aspects of the present invention respectively set forth in the present independent claims include, among other features, generating a print request page based on stored print setting information acquired from an external apparatus, generating a request file based on values input on the print request page, and then, establishing communication with the external apparatus and sending a print request file after displaying the calculated printing fee quotation.

For example, independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus for communicating via the Internet with an external apparatus, that comprises acquisition means for establishing a first communication with the external apparatus, acquiring print setting information from the external apparatus, and storing the print setting information in

a memory, and page generation means for generating a print request page based on the print setting information, after suspension of the first communication and before establishing a second communication with the external apparatus. Also provided are file generation means for generating a print request file according to values input on the print request page, and calculating means for calculating a printing fee quotation for the generated print request file. Print request means serve for establishing the second communication with the external apparatus and sending the generated print request file, after executing a process for displaying the calculated printing fee quotation. Also, according to Claim 1, the print request page is generated before the communication with the external apparatus is established by the print request means.

In contrast, *Matsuyama* relates to a system in which a print order file received from a client 101 is transferred to a print server 104 (see Fig. 1). Generally, in the *Matsuyama* system, low-resolution images are used for purposes of editing, and higher-resolution ones are used only for printing, to reduce the transmission loads on the system. Applicants urge strongly that nothing in *Matsuyama* would teach or suggest calculating a print fee based on a print request file, as is recited in Claim 1, much less doing so in combination with establishing a communication with an external apparatus to send the print request file after display of the calculated print fee. For at least those reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Matsuyama* taken alone.

Moreover, in the *Sasaki* system, a printer generates a preview image of a document to display on a client computer; that, however, is not seen to supply what is missing from *Matsuyama* as a reference against Claim 1. Accordingly, even if these two patents are combined, and even if such combination would be permissible, the result would not meet the terms of Claim 1, and that claim is therefore believed to be allowable over those documents.

Each of the other independent claims also contains recitations to which the foregoing arguments apply, and thus, each independent claim is deemed to be clearly allowable over *Matsuyama* and *Sasaki*, taken separately or in any permissible combination (if any exists).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.


The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 415103v1